



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

09/651,907

08/30/2000

John Underwood

730301-2013

2355

20999 7590 07/25/2008
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER

CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/651,907 | Applicant(s) UNDERWOOD ET AL. | |
| | Examiner JOSHUA D. CAMPBELL | Art Unit 2178 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-26 and 28-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-26 and 28-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Request for continued examination filed on 5/27/2008.
2. Claims 1, 3-26, and 28-52 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 26, 51, and 52 are independent claims. Claims 1, 26, 51, and 52 have been amended.
3. The rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-16, 18, 20, 22-26, 28-30, 32, 34-41, 43, 45, 47-50, 51, and 52 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baxter et al. (US Patent Number 6,356,903, filed on December 30, 1998) in view of Barr et al. (hereinafter Barr, US Patent Number 5,742,816, issued on April 21, 1998) has been withdrawn to the amendments presented.
4. The rejection of claims 6, 8, 31, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baxter et al. (US Patent Number 6,356,903, filed on December 30, 1998) in view of Barr et al. (hereinafter Barr, US Patent Number 5,742,816, issued on April 21, 1998) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ryan et al. (US Patent Number 6,421,675, filed on July 15, 1998) has been withdrawn to the amendments presented.
5. The rejection of claims 17, 19, 21, 42, 44, and 46 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baxter et al. (US Patent Number 6,356,903, filed on December 30, 1998) in view of Barr et al. (hereinafter Barr, US Patent Number 5,742,816, issued on April 21, 1998) as applied to claims 1, 18, 26, and 43 above, and further in view of Hill et al. (US Patent Number 6,023,714, filed on April 24, 1997) has been withdrawn to the amendments presented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-16, 18, 20, 22-26, 28-30, 32, 34-41, 43, 45, 47-50, 51, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baxter et al. (US Patent Number 6,356,903, filed on December 30, 1998) in view of Barr et al. (hereinafter Barr, US Patent Number 5,742,816, issued on April 21, 1998) further in view of Hanson et al. (hereinafter Hanson, US Patent Number 5,956,736, issued September 21, 1999).

Regarding independent claim 1, Baxter et al. (hereafter referred to as Baxter) discloses a method in which content (dimensions) including formatting components and organizational components are stored in a repository (column 2, lines 1-11 of Baxter). Baxter discloses a method in which format components, templates which define formats (characteristics), are stored in a repository. The formats define what content is used (subset) and how it is to be formatted (column 4, lines 25-53 of Baxter). Baxter also discloses a method in which a web document is based on a template (column 14, lines 5-28 of Baxter) and it is assembled by a system (description generator) to create a complete set (description) of content, organizational components and form components (column 16, lines 28-37 of Baxter). Baxter discloses that editors may edit any of the content at any time, thus editing the description (column 1, lines 39-42 of Baxter). Baxter discloses external interfaces are provided to handle external components such as externally hosted applications that generate custom content for inclusion in the web

site from external repositories (databases) (column 5, line 58-column 6, line 11 of Baxter). Baxter et al. does not disclose that data is stored according to an industry type classification. However, Barr shows that it is notoriously well-known to store data according to classifications (column 1, lines 66-column 2, lines 20 of Barr). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Baxter et al. and Barr because categorized data is easier for a user to search.

Neither Baxter nor Barr explicitly disclose displaying a preview which is then changed, the changes being automatically propagated to the website. However, Hanson discloses a WYSIWYG (what you see is what you get) HTML editor, in which a user is presented a preview of the website and the user edits the preview, at which point all of the visual changes made to the preview are incorporated into the actual website itself (column 2, lines 22-55 of Hanson). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Baxter and Barr with the notoriously well-known teachings of Hanson for using a WYSIWYG editor because it would have allowed the user to pay greater attention to the visual appeal of the website while making changes.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Baxter discloses a method in which a template can be used to create more than one finalized web page (description), thus the probability is less than one that it will create the same description using the same template (column 15, line 66-column 16, line 9 of Baxter).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Baxter discloses a method in which templates are used to create new documents that are different from other documents created based on the template (column 16, lines 1-22 of Baxter).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Baxter discloses a method in which a complete set (description) created based on a template is stored in a repository (column 16, lines 38-50 of Baxter).

Regarding dependent claim 7, Baxter discloses a method in which templates are used to create new documents that are different from other documents created based on the template (column 16, lines 1-22 of Baxter). Thus, the method is non-deterministic because it allows for more than one possible result.

Regarding dependent claims 9-16, Baxter discloses a method in which content includes raw content (text, graphics, images), organization (layout and navigation), java applications (component applications), colors, and outline (theme) (column 4, lines 25-67, column 14, lines 5-28, and column 16, lines 1-9 of Baxter).

Regarding dependent claim 18, Baxter discloses a method in which the finalized document corresponds to a set of content, organization and format (more than two dimensions combined together) (column 16, lines 28-37 of Baxter).

Regarding dependent claim 20, Baxter discloses a method in which the definitions set forth by the template use only a portion (subset) of the content (select pictures, certain colors, etc.) available (column 2, lines 1-24 of Baxter).

Regarding dependent claim 22, Baxter discloses a method in which the definitions set forth by the template use only a portion (subset) of the content (select pictures, certain colors, etc.) available (column 2, lines 1-24 of Baxter).

Regarding dependent claim 23, Baxter discloses a method in which the finalized document corresponds to a set of content, organization and format (more than two dimensions combined together) as defined by the template (column 16, lines 28-37 of Baxter).

Regarding dependent claims 24-25, Baxter discloses a method in which a corporate logo may be applied to a set of templates to designate them for use on a corporate site (specific industry) or templates can be created without a specific logo between them (general industry) (column 12, lines 7-43 of Baxter).

Regarding claims 26, 28-30, 32, 34-41, 43, 45, and 47-50, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-16, 18, 20, and 22-25. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-16, 18, 20, 22-25.

Regarding independent claims 51 and 52, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claim 1. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claim 1.

8. Claims 6, 8, 31, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baxter et al. (US Patent Number 6,356,903, filed on December 30, 1998) in view of Barr et al. (hereinafter Barr, US Patent Number 5,742,816, issued on April 21, 1998) further in view of Hanson et al. (hereinafter Hanson, US Patent Number 5,956,736, issued September 21, 1999) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ryan et al. (US Patent Number 6,421,675, filed on July 15, 1998).

Regarding dependent claim 6-8, Baxter does not disclose a method in which a description is generated randomly or pseudo-randomly. However, Ryan et al. discloses a method in which a results page for a search engine randomly selects applicable results (content) to put into a template for a results page that is generated (column 22, Ryan et al.). Since the random selection is completed by a computation it is by definition also pseudo-random. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the method of Baxter in combination with the method of Ryan et al. because it gives the opportunity for the less popular content to viewed on the generated web pages.

Regarding dependent claims 31 and 33, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 6 and 8. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claims 6 and 8

9. Claims 17, 19, 21, 42, 44, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baxter et al. (US Patent Number 6,356,903, filed on December 30, 1998) in view of Barr et al. (hereinafter Barr, US Patent Number 5,742,816, issued on April 21, 1998) further in view of Hanson et al. (hereinafter Hanson, US Patent Number 5,956,736, issued September 21, 1999) as applied to claims 1, 18, 26, and 43 above, and further in view of Hill et al. (US Patent Number 6,023,714, filed on April 24, 1997).

Regarding dependent claim 17, Baxter does not disclose a method in which one of the dimensions is the platform used to access the site. However, Hill et al. (hereafter referred to as Hill) discloses a method in which a web document is generated using a stylesheet (template) in which it is properly formatted and organized based on the system the user is using to view the document (column 2, lines 15-65 of Hill). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Baxter and Hill because it would have allowed more users to properly view the generated document.

Regarding dependent claim 19, Baxter does not disclose the use of a predetermined relationship between at least two characteristics. However, Hill discloses a method in which all the characteristics of the dimensions are share a predetermined relationship with the platform used to access a document in stylesheets in order to properly format the document for all platforms, which dictates other characteristics selected (i.e. format, content, color, etc.) (column 1, lines 15-65 of Hill). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have combined the methods of Baxter and Hill because it would have allowed more users to properly view the generated document.

Regarding dependent claim 21, Baxter does not disclose the use of a predetermined relationship between at least two characteristics. However, Hill discloses a method in which all the characteristics of the dimensions are share a predetermined relationship with the platform used to access a document in stylesheets in order to properly format the document for all platforms (column 1, lines 15-65 of Hill). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Baxter and Hill because it would have allowed more users to properly view the generated document.

Regarding dependent claims 42, 44, and 46, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 17, 19, and 21. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claims 17, 19, and 21.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-26, and 28-52 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOSHUA D. CAMPBELL whose telephone number is (571)272-4133. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30 AM - 4:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Joshua D Campbell/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178
July 16, 2008